

agents apprehended 1.12 million people along our border coming into our country unlawfully. Can you imagine that? Where we did build fencing along the San Diego border—only 14 miles, but it was one of the worst areas—that area was tremendously improved. Crime went down, drug dealing went down, violence went down, illegal immigration plummeted and property values went up.

But we have 1,800 miles along the border. This bill would not provide funding and authorization but for fencing about one-third of that distance.

I will share with my colleagues some of the debate in the House of Representatives recently, as they passed the very bill that is before us. Chairman ROYCE—he is from California—who chairs the International Terrorism and Nonproliferation Subcommittee talked about the difficulties they have had with a breach, a gap in the border fencing. He said this: It is called “smugglers’ gulch,” a fence that runs from the foothills to the ocean through that small 3-mile breach. It has taken 8½ years to get the California Coastal Commission to go along with closing that fence in consultation—8½ years to get it done.

He talked about the problem of that gap. And he talked about the field hearings he had participated in. He said: We heard from witnesses, and we heard them express that border fencing was very effective. He quoted Darryl Griffen, who is the chief agent in San Diego for the Border Patrol—the chief agent. Mr. Griffen, referring to the fencing, said this: It is a great force multiplier. It expands our enforcement capacity. It allows us the discretion to redeploy agents to areas of vulnerability or risk. It is one component that certainly has been integral to everything we have accomplished here raising the level of security.

That is what the chief of the Border Patrol for San Diego said. So people will tell you fencing makes no difference, it is not important, it does not help. It is not so. Listen to the professionals. I know President Bush has been reluctant to support fencing, but this man works for President Bush. He testified, as has Secretary Chertoff, about the subject. Secretary of Homeland Security Chertoff supports the fence, the bill that we passed in the Senate. Indeed, it was passed on his recommendation, the details of it were.

Then Chairman ROYCE, in the House, who chairs the International Terrorism Subcommittee, said this about the dangerous people who are coming across the border: So we see people coming over the border illegally from Afghanistan, Angola, Jordan, Qatar, Pakistan, Yemen. And I will give you one example. Mohammed Karani is the brother of a commander of Hezbollah in south Lebanon. He came over the border in my State in the trunk of a car. He paid a coyote to get him across the border. He was later arrested in Dearborn, Michigan. He is serving 4½ years. He is

a member of Hezbollah. He was in the process of securing funds and resources for Hezbollah in the United States.

He then goes on to say: Two border Governors have declared states of emergency over illegal immigration. Then one of the agents told him a personal story of stopping a man who had been trained in an Afghan training camp originally from Uzbekistan. This man injured the Border Patrol agent, actually bit his arm as he was trying to take him down. This agent told Chairman ROYCE one of his concerns was this was the second time the man had tried to come into the country after 9/11.

So I would say we are dealing with an important issue. I am glad to see from previous votes that the Senate is coming around to a uniform position on it. It is time for us now, as we wind up this session, to fulfill our obligation for actually making a law, legislation to authorize the building of the fence, and then, in the few days we have left, to come forward with legislation that will actually fund this requirement we authorize. Otherwise, we risk going home and even further arousing cynicism and irritation among the voters who have sent us here.

I believe we can get it done. I think we are moving in the right direction. I am optimistic. But there will be some around here who would like to see it fail in the last minute. Let’s don’t let that happen. Let’s follow through, and let’s be consistent with the wishes of the American people and the security of the United States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 1 hour in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me first say to my friend from Alabama that as to the last comment he made about whether at the last minute someone may come along and try to torpedo this, I suspect that might be the case. It is like when I had the amendment to make English our national language—and 89 percent of the American people were for it; 70 percent of the Hispanics were for it—and yet some of the liberals in this Chamber were catering to La Raza, an extremist group, in trying to torpedo what we are doing, and merely doing what 51 other countries have done, making English the official language.

I also want to say to my friend from Alabama, I have never been prouder to serve on the Armed Services Committee with any member more than I am to serve with him. It was you and seven other of the Republicans who tried from the very beginning to give the President everything he needed to interrogate these people, to prosecute these people, and to get as much human intelligence as possible to save American lives. I thank the Senator

publicly for standing up as one of all nine of us.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think the Senator has provided great leadership on security on a number of issues. You may be talking about other issues as we go forward right now, but I know the Senator would agree that our borders do represent vulnerabilities, and fixing our borders is also an aspect of national security, as I read of Hezbollah people coming across and others who have dangerous reputations.

I also thank the Senator for his steadfast leadership and his clear thinking in regard to the fundamental issue that barriers do represent a critical part of what we need to do to have a lawful border.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama. And I think we will prevail. As to what you are suggesting, and what you have been suggesting over the last few minutes, the vast majority of the American people are on our side. They know as to people who say: You cannot secure our border, fences will not work—they worked for a long time up in between North Korea and South Korea. I think they will work down here, too.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about the most media-hyped environmental issue of all time. It is the word that gets everybody upset when you say it and the word or the phrase that many politicians are afraid to say, and that is “global warming.” I have spoken more about global warming than any other politician in Washington today. My speech will be a bit different from the previous seven floor speeches I have made on this subject, as I focus not only on the science, as I have many times before, but on the media’s coverage of climate change.

Global warming—just the term—evokes many Members in this Chamber, the media, Hollywood elites, and our pop culture to nod their heads and fret about an impending climate disaster. As the Senator who has spent more time educating about the actual facts about global warming, I will address some of the recent media coverage of global warming and Hollywood’s involvement in this issue. And, of course, I will also discuss former Vice President Al Gore’s movie, “An Inconvenient Truth.”

Let’s keep in mind, I do chair the committee in the Senate called Environment and Public Works, the committee that has jurisdiction. I recall so well when I first became chairman of this committee, almost 4 years ago, I was actually a believer that because I had heard it so many times there must be something to this thing, until I started looking at the science. But I have talked about that before.

Since 1895, the media has alternated between global cooling and global

warming scares during four separate and sometimes overlapping time periods. From 1895 until the 1930s, the media peddled a coming ice age. From the late 1920s until the 1960s, they warned of global warming. From the 1950s until the 1970s, they warned us again of a coming ice age. This makes modern global warming the fourth estate's fourth attempt to promote opposing climate change fears during the last 100 years—4 times during the last 100 years—and every time just as hysterical as the time before.

Recently, advocates of alarmism have grown increasingly desperate to try to convince the public that global warming is the greatest moral issue of our generation. Just last week, the vice president of London's Royal Society sent a chilling letter to the media encouraging them to stifle the voices of scientists skeptical of climate alarmism.

During the past year, the American people have been served up an unprecedented parade of environmental alarmism by the media and entertainment industry, which links every possible weather event to global warming. The year 2006 saw many major organs of the media dismiss any pretense of balance and objectivity on climate change coverage and instead crossed squarely on into global warming advocacy.

First, I will summarize some of the recent developments in the controversy over whether humans have created a climate catastrophe. One of the key aspects the United Nations, environmental groups, and the media have promoted as the "smoking gun" of proof of catastrophic global warming is the so-called hockey stick temperature graph by climate scientist Michael Mann from Virginia and some of his liberal colleagues.

This graph purported to show that temperatures in the northern hemisphere remained relatively stable over 900 years, and then spiked upward as we moved into the 20th century. And that spike would be the "blade" on the hockey stick. They say this was due to human activity. Mann, who also copublishes a global warming propaganda blog—reportedly set up with the help of an environmental group—had his hockey stick come under severe scrutiny.

The hockey stick was completely and thoroughly broken once and for all in 2006. Several years ago, two Canadian researchers tore apart the statistical foundation for the hockey stick. In 2006, both the National Academy of Sciences and an independent researcher further refuted the foundation of the hockey stick.

The National Academy of Sciences report reaffirmed the existence of the Medieval Warming Period. That was from about 900 AD to 1300 AD, and the Little Ice Age from about 1500 to approximately 1850. Both of these periods occurred long before the invention of the SUV or human industrial activity and it could not have possibly im-

pacted the Earth's climate. In fact, scientists believe the Earth was warmer than today during the Medieval Warming Period, when the Vikings grew crops in Greenland. We all remember reading about that. That was a period of time when the Vikings, all of a sudden, because it became warmer back around 1000 AD, started inhabiting Greenland. They flourished up there, until the Little Ice Age came along in 1500, and most of them died at that time. Now the climate alarmists have attempted to erase the inconvenient Medieval Warming Period from the Earth's climate history for at least a decade.

David Demming, an assistant professor at the University of Oklahoma's College of Geosciences, can testify firsthand about this effort. Dr. Demming was welcomed into the close-knit group of global warming believers after he published a paper in 1995 that noted some warming in the 20th century. He says he was subsequently contacted by a prominent global warming alarmist and told point blank:

We have to get rid of the medieval warming period.

When the "hockey stick" first appeared in 1998, it did exactly that. This guy, Michael Mann, turned around and ignored the fact that we had this medieval warming period and then went into the little ice age, which changed it.

The media has missed big pieces of the puzzle when it comes to the Earth's temperatures and mankind's carbon dioxide, CO₂, emissions. It is very simplistic to feign horror and say the 1-degree Fahrenheit temperature increase in the 20th century means we are all doomed. First of all, the 1-degree Fahrenheit rise coincided with the greatest advancement in living standards, life expectancy, food production, and human health in the history of our planet. So it is hard to argue that the global warming we experienced in the 20th century was somehow negative or part of a catastrophic trend.

Here on the chart you can see during this period of time, when things were flourishing and they went down, it was far more prosperous during the medieval part.

Second, what the climate alarmists and their advocates in the media have continued to ignore is the fact that the little ice age, which resulted in harsh winters which froze New York Harbor and caused untold deaths, ended about 1850. So trying to prove manmade global warming by comparing the well-known fact that today's temperatures are warmer than during the little ice age is like comparing summer to winter to show a catastrophic temperature trend.

In addition, something that the media almost never addresses are the holes in the theory that CO₂ has been the driving force in global warming.

The alarmists fail to adequately explain why temperatures began warming at the end of the little ice age in about

1850, long before manmade CO₂ emissions could have impacted the climate. Then in about 1940, just as manmade CO₂ emissions rose sharply—about 80 percent, with the largest increase in the middle of the 1940s—the temperatures began a decline, and that lasted until about the 1970s, prompting the media and many scientists to fear a coming ice age.

I am saying that this increase in CO₂ emissions did not precipitate a warming period; it precipitated a cooling period.

If CO₂ is the driving force of the global climate change, why do so many in the media ignore the many skeptical scientists who cite these rather obvious inconvenient truths?

My skeptical views on manmade catastrophic global warming have only strengthened as new science comes in. There have been recent findings in peer-reviewed literature over the past few years showing that the Antarctic is getting colder, and ice is growing. And a new study in Geophysical Research Letters found that the Sun was responsible for 50 percent of the 20th century warming. Now, that is shocking: the Sun is responsible for warmth.

Recently, many scientists, including a leading member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, predicted long-term global cooling may be on the horizon due to a projected decrease in the Sun's output. It is going to start getting cooler again.

A letter that was sent to the Canadian Prime Minister on April 6 of this year by 60 prominent scientists who question the basis for climate alarmism, clearly explains the current state of the scientific knowledge on global warming. Keep in mind, these 60 scientists were the ones who recommended back in the 1990s that Canada sign onto the Kyoto Treaty. They wrote this to Prime Minister Harper:

If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded that it was not necessary.

The letter also noted:

"Climate change is real" is a meaningless phrase used repeatedly by activists to convince the public that a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause. Neither of these fears is justified. Global climate changes occur all the time due to natural causes, and the human impact still remains impossible to distinguish from the natural "noise."

These are scientists talking. People realize that these cycles go on. God is still up there, and we have the cycles every 1,500 years or so. Every time this happens, alarmists get this out and say we are all going to die.

One of the ways alarmists have pounded the mantra of a "consensus" on global warming into our pop culture is through the use of computer models that project future calamity. But the science is not there to place so much faith in scary computer model scenarios which extrapolate the current and projected buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and conclude that the planet faces certain doom.

Dr. Vincent Gray, a research scientist and a 2001 reviewer with the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel—they started like most bad things do, with the U.N. Back in the 1990s they came out with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and Dr. Gray said:

The effects of aerosols, and their uncertainties, are such as to nullify completely the reliability of any of the climate models.

Earlier this year, the director of the International Arctic Research Center in Fairbanks, AK, testified to Congress that highly publicized climate models showing a disappearing Arctic were nothing more than “science fiction.”

That is not Senator INHOFE talking. That is the director of the International Arctic Research Center in Fairbanks, who ought to know a little bit about the Arctic.

In fact, after years of hearing about the computer-generated scary scenarios about the future of our planet, I now believe that the greatest climate threat we face may be coming from alarmist computer models.

This threat is originating from the software installed on hard drives of the publicity-seeking climate modelers. It is long past time for us to separate climate change fact from hysteria.

One final point—and there are many. We have made seven talks, averaging about an hour apiece, about the flawed science. One final point about the science: I am approached by many in the media and others who ask: What if you are wrong, INHOFE, to doubt the dire global warming predictions? Will you be able to live with yourself for opposing the Kyoto Protocol?

My answer is blunt. The history of the modern environmental movement is chock full of predictions of doom that never came true. We have all heard the dire predictions about the threat of overpopulation, resource scarcity, mass starvation, and the projected death of our oceans. None of them came true. Yet it never stopped the doomsayers from predicting a dire environmental future.

The more the eco-doomsayers' predictions fail, the more the eco-doomsayers predict. These failed predictions are just one reason I respect the serious scientists out there today debunking the latest scare mongering on climate change: scientists such as MIT's Richard Lindzen; former Colorado State climatologist, Roger Pielke, Sr.; the University of Alabama's Roy Spencer and John Christy; Virginia State climatologist Patrick Michaels; Colorado State University's William Gray; atmospheric physicist, S. Fred Singer; Willie Soon of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics; Oregon State climatologist George Taylor; astrophysicist Sallie Baliunas, to name a few.

You never hear about these well-established scientists.

More important, it is the global warming alarmists who should ask the question: What if they are correct about manmade catastrophic global

warming? They have come up with no meaningful solution to their supposed climate crisis in the two decades they have been hyping this issue.

If the alarmists truly believe that manmade greenhouse gas emissions are dooming the planet, then they must face up to the fact that symbolism does not solve a supposed climate crisis.

It is long past time for them to separate symbolism from fact. Let me show you this. This is a chart I used on the floor before. A very prominent Senator from the Northeast who bought into this hoax called global warming—after he researched this chart, found it was true. This chart says in the event that everything is true that they have said about global warming, and if all of the countries—I am talking about the developing nations, as well as the developed nations—adhere to or achieve Kyoto goals, this is the difference it would make by 2050. It is not even measurable.

A final point on the science of climate change. Again, I am approached by many in the media and others who ask what if you are wrong? I think the answer is that they have been wrong all along.

The alarmists freely concede that the Kyoto Protocol, even if fully ratified and complied with, would not have any meaningful impact on global temperatures. Keep in mind that Kyoto is not even close to being complied with by many of the ratifying nations. Fifteen European nations ratified the Kyoto Protocol, and 13 have not made their goals. So they are not going to be able to do it.

Many of the nations that ratified Kyoto are now realizing what I have been saying all along: The Kyoto Protocol is a lot of economic pain for no climate gain.

Legislation that has been proposed in this Chamber would have even less of a temperature effect than Kyoto's undetectable impact. And more recently, global warming alarmists and the media have been praising California for taking action to limit CO₂. But here again this costly, feel-good, California measure, which is actually far less severe than Kyoto, will have no impact on the climate, only the economy.

Symbolism does not solve a climate crisis.

In addition, we now have many environmentalists and Hollywood celebrities, such as Laurie David, who have been advocating measures like changing standard light bulbs in your home to fluorescents to help avert global warming. Changing to more energy-efficient light bulbs is fine, but to somehow imply that we can avert a climate disaster by these actions is absurd.

Once again, symbolism does not solve a climate crisis. But this symbolism may be hiding a dark side. While greenhouse gas limiting proposals may cost the industrialized West trillions of dollars, it is the effect on the developing world's poor that is being lost in this debate.

The Kyoto Protocol's post-2012 agenda, which mandates that the developing world be subjected to restrictions on greenhouse gases, could have the potential to severely restrict development in regions such as Africa, Asia, and South America, where some of the Earth's most energy-deprived people currently reside.

Expanding basic necessities like running water and electricity in the developing world are seen by many in the Green Movement as a threat to the planet's health that must be avoided.

Energy poverty equals a life of back-breaking poverty and premature death.

If we allow scientifically unfounded fears of global warming to influence policymakers to restrict future energy production and the creation of basic infrastructure in the developing world, billions of people will continue to suffer.

Last week, my committee heard testimony from Danish statistician Bjorn Lomborg, who was once a committed leftwing environmentalist until he realized that so much of what that the movement preached was based on bad science. Lomborg wrote a book called “The Skeptical Environmentalist” and has organized some of the world's top Nobel laureates to form the 2004 “Copenhagen Consensus,” which ranked the world's most pressing problems.

Guess what. They place global warming at the bottom of the list in terms of our planet's priorities. The “Copenhagen Consensus” found that the most important priorities for our planet include combating disease, stopping malaria, securing clean water, and building infrastructure to help lift the developing nations out of poverty.

I have made a lot of trips to Africa. A lot of people know I have had a mission there for well over 10 years now. Once you see the devastating poverty—we think we have poverty in this country. Well, if you saw their poverty and the kids running through the junk piles and rats biting at the heels of their bloody feet, you would realize that these fears about global warming are severely misguided.

I firmly believe that when the history of our era is written, future generations will look back with puzzlement and wonder why we spent so much time and effort on global warming fears and pointless solutions, such as the Kyoto protocol.

One of your favorite Frenchmen, Mr. President, Jacques Chirac, the French President, provided the key clue as to why so many in the international community still revere the Kyoto Protocol, when in 2000 he said Kyoto represents not climate change but represents “the first component of an authentic global governance.”

Furthermore, if your goal is to limit CO₂ emissions, the only effective way to go about it is the use of cleaner, more effective technologies that will meet the energy demands of this century and beyond.

The Bush administration and my Environment and Public Works Committee—the committee I chair—have been engaged in these efforts as we work to expand nuclear power and promote the Asian-Pacific Partnership. This partnership stresses the sharing of new technology among member nations, including three of the world's top 10 emitters—China, India, and Korea—all of whom are exempt from Kyoto.

Keep in mind, even if all these charts were true and everyone is going to comply with this, we passed in this Chamber just a very short while ago, by a unanimous vote, 96 to 0, legislation that said if you come back with any kind of treaty where we are going to treat developing nations differently from developed nations, we are going to oppose it. So it is unanimously opposed.

Many in the media, as I noted earlier, have taken it upon themselves to drop all pretense of balance on global warming and have instead become committed advocates for the issue.

Here is a quote from Newsweek. You have to listen to this, Mr. President. This is very important. I am going to quiz you later. This is a quote from Newsweek magazine:

There are numerous signs that the Earth's weather patterns have begun to change dramatically and that these changes may portend a drastic decline in food production—with serious political implications for just about every nation on Earth.

A headline in the New York Times reads:

Climate Changes Endanger World's Food Output.

Here is another quote from Time magazine:

As they review the bizarre and unpredictable weather pattern of the past several years, a growing number of scientists are beginning to suspect that many seemingly contradictory meteorological fluctuations are actually part of a global climate upheaval.

All this sounds very ominous. That is until one realizes that the three quotes I just read are from articles in 1975 editions of Newsweek magazine and the New York Times, and Time magazine in 1974. They were not referring to global warming; they were warning of a coming ice age. The same people who were hysterical back then are using the same words to describe what is happening today.

Let me repeat: All three of those quotes were published in the 1970s warning of a coming ice age. An ice age is coming; we are all going to die.

In addition to global cooling fears, Time magazine has also reported on global warming. Here is an example:

[Those] who claim that winters were harder when they were boys are quite right . . . weathermen have no doubt that the world at least for the time being is growing warmer.

Before one thinks that this is just another example of the media promoting former Vice President Gore's movie, one needs to know that the quote I just read is from Time maga-

zine and not a recent quote. It is from January 22, 1939. Yes, in 1939—9 years before former Vice President Gore was born and over three decades before Time magazine began hyping a coming ice age, and almost five decades before they returned to hyping global warming.

Time magazine, in 1951, pointed to receding permafrost in Russia as proof that the planet was warming.

In 1952, the New York Times noted that the “trump card” of global warming “has been the melting glaciers.”

But the media could not decide between warming or cooling scares. There are many more examples of the media and scientists flip-flopping between warming and cooling scares. They don't really care. They just want to scare you. They want to make sure you are scared, and then they are satisfied.

Here is a quote from the New York Times on fears of an approaching ice age:

Geologists Think the World May be Frozen Up Again.

That sentence appeared over 100 years ago in the February 24, 1895, edition of the New York Times. Let me repeat, 1895, not 1995.

A front-page article in the October 7, 1912, New York Times, just a few months after the Titanic struck an iceberg and sank, declared that a prominent professor “Warns Us of an Encroaching Ice Age.”

The very same day in 1912, the Los Angeles Times ran an article warning that the “human race will have to fight for its existence against the cold.”

An August 10, 1923, Washington Post article declared:

Ice Age Coming Here.

By the 1930s, the media took a break from reporting on the coming ice age and instead switched gears to promoting global warming. This is the 1930s:

America in Longest Warm Spell Since 1776; Temperature Line Records a 25-year Rise.

That was in an article in the New York Times on March 27, 1933.

The media of yesteryear was also not above injecting large amounts of fear and alarmism into their climate articles.

An August 9, 1923, front-page article in the Chicago Tribune declared:

Scientist Says Arctic Ice Will Wipe Out Canada.

The article quoted a Yale University professor who predicted that large parts of Europe and Asia would be “wiped out” and Switzerland would be “entirely obliterated.”

A December 29, 1974, New York Times article on global cooling reported that climatologists believed “the facts of the present climate change are such that the most optimistic experts would assign near certainty to major crop failure in a decade.”

The article also warned that unless Government officials reacted to the

coming catastrophe “mass deaths by starvation and probably in anarchy and violence” would result. In 1975, the New York Times reported that “a major cooling [was] widely considered to be inevitable.”

These past predictions of doom have a familiar ring, don't they? They sound strikingly similar to our modern media promotion of the former Vice President's brand of climate alarmism, an alarmism he believes will put him back in the White House.

After more than a century of alternating between global cooling and warming, one would think that this media history would serve a cautionary tale for today's voices in the media and scientific community who are promoting yet another round of eco-doom.

Much of the 100-year media history on climate change that I have documented today can be found in a publication entitled “Fire and Ice” from the Business and Media Institute.

Which raises the question: How has this embarrassing 100-year documented legacy of coverage on what turned out to be trendy climate science theories made the media more skeptical of today's sensational promoters of global warming? You be the judge.

On February 19 of this year, CBS News's “60 Minutes” produced a segment on the North Pole. The segment was a completely one-sided report alleging rapid and unprecedented melting at the polar cap. It even featured correspondent Scott Pelley claiming that the ice in Greenland was melting so fast that he barely got off an iceberg before it collapsed into the water.

Mr. President, “60 Minutes” failed to inform its viewers that a 2005 study by a scientist named Ola Johannessen and his colleagues showed that the interior of Greenland is gaining ice mass and that, according to scientists, the Arctic was warmer in the 1930s than it is today. If you see this film, they will say it is the warmest it has ever been. It is just not true.

By the way, around the edges of ice caps there is a phenomenon known as calving. So when it becomes thicker in the middle, it melts a little on the outside, but the overall volume density increases.

On March 19 of this year, “60 Minutes” profiled NASA scientists and alarmist James Hansen who was once again making allegations of being censored by the Bush administration. In this segment, objectivity and balance were again tossed aside in favor of a one-sided glowing profile of Hansen.

The “60 Minutes” segment made no mention of Hansen's partisan ties to former Democratic Vice President Al Gore or Hansen's receiving of a grant of a quarter of a million dollars from the leftwing Heinz Foundation run by Teresa Heinz Kerry. I guess she is Teresa Heinz now. There was also no mention of Hansen's subsequent endorsement of her husband JOHN KERRY for the presidency in 2004. He is a political activist. This was never mentioned in the “60 Minutes” segment.

Many in the media dwell on any industry support given to so-called climate skeptics, but the same media completely failed to note Hansen's huge grant from the leftwing Heinz Foundation.

The foundation's money originated from the Heinz family ketchup fortune. So it appears that the media makes a distinction between oil money and ketchup money.

Mr. President, "60 Minutes" also did not inform viewers that Hansen appeared to concede in a 2003 issue of "Natural Science" that the use of "extreme scenarios" to dramatize climate change "may have been appropriate one time" to drive the public's attention on the issue. In other words, it is all right to lie in order to drive the public's attention to an issue that you want them to have and to that opinion.

Why would "60 Minutes" ignore the basic tenets of journalism that call for objectivity and balance in sourcing and do such one-sided segments?

The answer was provided by correspondent Scott Pelley. Pelley told the CBS News Web site that he justified excluding scientists skeptical of global warming alarmism from his segments because he considers skeptics to be the equivalent of "Holocaust deniers."

This year also saw a New York Times reporter write a children's book entitled "The North Pole Was Here." The author of the book, New York Times reporter Andrew Revkin, wrote that it may someday be "easier to sail to than stand on" the North Pole in summer. So here we have a very prominent environmental reporter for the New York Times who is promoting the aspect of global warming alarmism in a book aimed at our kids.

In April of this year, Time magazine devoted an issue to global warming alarmism entitled "Be Afraid, Be Very Afraid." This is the same Time magazine which first warned of a coming ice age in the 1920s before it switched to warning about global warming in the 1930s, before it switched again to promoting the 1970s coming ice age scare. The April 3, 2006, global warming special report of Time magazine was a prime example of the media's shortcomings, as the magazine cited partisan leftwing environmental groups with a vested financial interest in hyping alarmism.

Headlines blared: "More and More Land is Being Devastated by Drought." "Earth is at the Tipping Point."

"The Climate is Crashing."

Time magazine did not make the slightest attempt to balance its reporting with any views of scientists skeptical of this alleged climate disaster.

I don't have journalism training, but I daresay calling a bunch of environmental groups with an obvious fundraising agenda and asking them to make wild speculations on how bad global warming might become is nothing more than advocacy for leftwing causes. It is a violation of basic journalistic standards.

To his credit, New York Times reporter Revkin saw fit to criticize Time magazine for its embarrassing coverage of climate science.

So in the end, Time's cover story title of "Be Worried, Be Very Worried" appears to have been apt. The American people should be worried—they should be very worried—of such shoddy journalism.

As to Al Gore's inconvenient truth, in May, our Nation was exposed to perhaps one of the slickest science propaganda films of all time. Former Vice President Gore's "An Inconvenient Truth," in addition to having the backing of Paramount Pictures to market this film, had the full backing of the media, and leading the cheerleading charge was none other than the Associated Press, and of course they had the elitists, from Hollywood.

On June 27, the Associated Press ran an article by Seth Borenstein that boldly declared:

"Scientists give two thumbs up to Gore's movie."

The article quoted only five scientists—two thumbs up, five scientists. They were praising Gore's science, despite the Associated Press having contacted over 100 scientists.

The fact that over 80 percent of the scientists contacted by the AP had not even seen the movie or that many scientists have harshly criticized the science presented by Gore did not dissuade the news outlet one bit from its mission to promote Gore's brand of climate alarmism.

Let's keep in mind, they said it is thumbs up, 100 percent of the scientists, and it was only 5 out of the 100.

I am almost at a loss as to how to begin to address the series of errors, misleading science, and unfounded speculation that appear in the former Vice President's film and in his book of the same name.

Here is what Richard Lindzen, a meteorologist from MIT, has written about "An Inconvenient Truth." He is talking about Al Gore and his movie. This is a scientist, Richard Lindzen, a meteorologist from MIT:

A general characteristic of Mr. Gore's approach is to ignore the fact that the Earth and its climate are dynamic; they are always changing even without any external forcing. To treat all change as something to fear is bad enough; to do so in order to exploit that fear is much worse.

That is exactly what Al Gore is doing.

What follows is a brief summary of the science the former Vice President promotes in either a wrong or misleading way:

He promoted the now debunked "hockey stick" temperature chart in an attempt to prove man's overwhelming impact on the climate.

He attempted to minimize the significance of the medieval warm period and the little ice age.

He insists on a link between increased hurricane activity and global warming that most scientists believe does not exist.

He asserted that today's Arctic is experiencing unprecedented warmth while ignoring that temperatures in the 1930s were as warm or warmer than they are today.

He claimed the Antarctic is warming and losing ice but failed to note that is only true of a small region and the vast bulk has been cooling and gaining ice. This is the Antarctic.

He hyped unfounded fears that Greenland's ice is in danger of disappearing.

He erroneously claimed that the ice cap on Mount Kilimanjaro is disappearing because of global warming, even while the region cools and researchers blame ice loss on local land-use practices. What they are talking about here is they had deforested the area down below. That was the reason. It had nothing to do with CO₂, obviously.

He made assertions of massive future sea level rise that is way outside of any supposed scientific consensus and is not supported in even the most alarmist literature.

He incorrectly implied that a Peruvian glacier's retreat is due to global warming, while ignoring the fact that the region has been cooling since the 1930s and other glaciers in South America are advancing.

He blamed global warming for water loss in Africa's Lake Chad despite NASA scientists concluding that local population and grazing factors are the more likely culprits.

He inaccurately claimed polar bears are drowning in significant numbers due to melting ice when in fact they are thriving.

He completely failed to inform viewers that the 48 scientists who accused President Bush of distorting science were part of a political advocacy group set up to support the Democratic Presidential candidate John Kerry in 2004.

That was just a brief sampling of some of the errors presented in "An Inconvenient Truth." Imagine how long the list would have been if I had actually seen the movie. There wouldn't be enough time to deliver the speech today.

So along comes Tom Brokaw. Following the promotion of "An Inconvenient Truth," the press did not miss a beat in their role as advocates for global warming fears.

ABC News put forth its best effort to secure its standing as an advocate for climate alarmism when the network put out a call for people to submit their anecdotal global warming horror stories in June for use in a future news segment.

In July, the Discovery Channel presented a documentary on global warming narrated by former NBC anchor Tom Brokaw. The program presented only those views of scientists promoting the idea that humans are destroying the Earth's climate. You don't have to take my word for the program's overwhelming bias. A Bloomberg TV news review noted:

"You'll find more dissent at a North Korean political rally than in this program" because of its lack of scientific objectivity.

Brokaw also presented climate alarmist James Hansen to viewers as unbiased, failing to note his quarter-million-dollar grant from the partisan Heinz Foundation or his endorsement of Democratic Presidential nominee John Kerry in 2004 and his role promoting former Vice President Gore's Hollywood movie. Brokaw, however, did find time to impugn the motives of scientists skeptical of climate alarmism when he featured paid environmental partisan Michael Oppenheimer, of the group Environmental Defense, accusing skeptics of being bought out by fossil fuel interests.

The fact remains that political campaign funding by environmental groups to promote climate and environmental alarmism dwarfs spending by the fossil fuel industry by 3 to 1. Environmental special interests, through their 527s, spent over \$19 million compared to \$7 million spent by the oil and gas industry through political action committees in the 2004 election cycle.

I am reminded of a question the media often asks me about how much I have received in campaign contributions from the fossil fuel industry. My unapologetic answer is always: Not enough, especially when you consider the millions partisan environmental groups pour into political campaigns.

Continuing with our media analysis: On July 24, 2006, the Los Angeles Times featured an op-ed by Naomi Oreskes, a social scientist at the University of California, San Diego, and the author of a 2004 *Science* magazine study. Oreskes insisted that a review of 928 scientific papers showed there was 100 percent consensus that global warming was not caused by natural climate variations. This study was also featured in former Vice President Al Gore's "An Inconvenient Truth."

However, the analysis in *Science* magazine excluded nearly 11,000 studies or more than 90 percent of the papers dealing with global warming, according to a critique by British social scientist Benny Peiser. Peiser also pointed out that less than 2 percent of the climate studies in the survey actually endorsed the so-called "consensus view" that human activity is driving global warming and some of the studies actually opposed that view. Oreskes called 2 percent, 100 percent. But despite this manufactured "consensus," the media continued to ignore any attempt to question the orthodoxy of climate alarmism.

As the dog days of August rolled in, the American people were once again hit with more hot hype regarding global warming, this time from the New York Times op-ed pages. A columnist penned an August 3 column filled with so many inaccuracies it is a wonder the editor of the Times saw fit to publish it. For instance, Bob Herbert's column

made dubious claims about polar bears, the snows of Kilimanjaro, and he attempted to link this past summer's heat wave in the United States to global warming—something even the alarmist James Hansen does not support.

Finally, a September 15, 2006, Reuters News article claimed that polar bears in the Arctic are threatened with extinction by global warming. The article by correspondent Alister Doyle quoted a visitor to the Arctic—now listen to this, Mr. President—a visitor to the Arctic who claimed he saw two distressed polar bears. According to the Reuters article, the man noted that one of the polar bears looked to be dead and the other one looked to be exhausted. The article did not state the bears were actually dead or exhausted, they merely looked that way. Have we really arrived at the point where major news outlets in the United States are reduced to analyzing whether polar bears in the Arctic appear restless? How reporting such as this gets approved for publication by the editors at Reuters, I don't know. What happened to covering the hard science in this issue?

What was missing from the Reuters News article was the fact that according to biologists who study animals, polar bears are doing quite well. Biologist Dr. Mitchell Taylor from the Arctic government of Nunavut, which is a territory of Canada, refuted these claims in May when he noted that—this is a quote. Keep in mind I am quoting the biologist Dr. Mitchell Taylor from the Arctic government. He said:

Of the 13 populations of polar bears in Canada, 11 are stable or increasing in number. They are not going extinct, or even appear to be affected at present.

Sadly, it appears that reporting anecdotes and hearsay is now fast replacing the tenets of journalism for many media outlets.

It is an inconvenient truth that so far 2006 has been a year in which most major segments of the media have given up on any quest for journalistic balance, fairness, and objectivity when it comes to climate change. The global warming alarmists and their friends in the media have attempted to smear scientists who dare to question the premise of manmade catastrophic global warming, and as a result some scientists have seen their reputations and their research funding dry up.

The media has so relentlessly promoted global warming fears that a British group called the Institute For Public Policy Research—and this from a left-leaning group—issued a report in 2006 accusing media outlets of engaging in what they termed "climate porn" in order to attract the public's attention. Bob Carter, a paleoclimate geologist from James Cook University in Australia, has described how the media promotes this kind of fear:

Each such alarmist article is larded with words such as "if," "might," "could," "probably," "perhaps," "expected," "projected,"

or "modeled," and many involve such deep dreaming, or ignorance of scientific facts or principles, that they are akin to nonsense.

He concluded this in an op-ed in April of this year.

Another example of this relentless hype is the reporting on the seemingly endless number of global warming impact studies which do not even address whether global warming is going to happen. They merely project the impact of potential temperature increases.

The media endlessly hypes studies that purportedly show that global warming could increase mosquito populations, malaria, West Nile virus, heat waves and hurricanes, threaten the oceans, damage coral reefs, boost poison ivy growth, damage vineyards and global food crops, to name just a few of the global warming-linked calamities. Oddly, according to the media reports, warmer temperatures almost never seem to have any positive effects on plant or animal life or food production.

Fortunately, the media's addiction to so-called "climate porn" has failed to seduce many Americans. According to a July Pew Research Center poll, the American public is split about evenly between those who say global warming is due to human activity versus those who believe it is from natural factors or not happening at all. This is significantly down from the previous polls. In addition, an August Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg poll found that most Americans do not attribute the cause of recent severe weather events to global warming, and the portion of Americans who believe global warming is naturally occurring is on the rise. It is nothing short of a miracle and amazing that the American people are not buying this alarmism. It is all they see on TV. It is all they hear about. I would rather believe the American people know when their intelligence is being insulted and they know when they are being used and when they are being duped by the hysterical left.

The American people deserve much better from our fourth estate. We have a right to expect accuracy and objectivity on climate change coverage. We have a right to expect balance in sourcing and fair analysis from reporters who cover the issue. Above all, the media must roll back this mantra that there is scientific "consensus" of impending climatic doom as an excuse to ignore recent science. I used to get this all the time from the left. They say: Well, the consensus is already there; we don't want to talk about science. No wonder they don't—because most of the science since 1999 has refuted everything they are asserting. After all, there was a so-called scientific consensus that there were nine planets in our solar system until Pluto was recently demoted.

I am a realist. I want to challenge the news media to reverse course and report on the objective science of climate change, stop ignoring legitimate voices in this scientific debate, and

stop being used by the hysterical left. Breaking the cycles of media hysteria will not be easy since hysteria sells and it is very profitable, but I really believe the issue is getting worn out. They have not been able to come up with anything to support their side. And as Winston Churchill said:

The truth is incontrovertible. Panic may resent it, ignorance may deride it, malice may destroy it, but there it is. And it will be there, and we will understand.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask that I be recognized to speak as in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor of the Senate today to talk about the importance of immigration reform in a comprehensive manner. We are in the last week of this legislative session before the November elections. It is obvious to me, in terms of what is going on in the country, that the leadership of the Senate, the Congress, and the White House has decided to allow politics to triumph over the very fundamental national purposes for which we have tried to work together with respect to comprehensive immigration reform.

It is my hope that those speaking for principled immigration reform stand up and say that we are not going to let politics triumph over national security, that we are not going to let politics triumph over the rule of law, which is a central tenet of our Nation, basic to the stability of our Nation, and that we are not going to let politics triumph over the economic and human and moral realities with which we deal in immigration.

As we move forward in the days ahead, dealing with this fence legislation, legislation that would create a fence across Arizona and Texas and Mexico and the possibility of a fence between the United States and Canada, I hope the voices of reason that brought Republicans and Democrats together on the floor of this Senate to say we needed comprehensive immigration reform, once again will say we reject piecemeal legislation that deals with creating a fence only because we know that will not be the answer for the comprehensive immigration reform we need.

When I look at the map which has come out of the House of Representa-

tives which would create a fence which would essentially follow the entire border of Arizona and large pieces of the Texas border, it seems to me what we are doing here in Washington is we are telling those States that we know better here in Washington where the fence ought to be located and we will authorize this fence to be built only in these particular locations. We are, in fact, not listening to the Department of Homeland Security and to our Border Patrol officers who know there are places where it is appropriate for us to put a fence. Indeed, in our legislation here in the Senate, what we did is we authorized the construction of a fence, but we also recognized there was latitude to be given to those experts who are in charge of making sure we create a secure border.

When I look at what we are trying to do in this debate which will take place with respect to the Secure Fence Act on the floor this year, I would like us to look back and see what was being said around the country with respect to immigration reform just a few months ago when we were debating immigration reform here on the floor of the Senate.

Our Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary Chertoff, said this about the fence:

Fencing has its place in some areas, but as a total solution, I don't think it's a good solution.

Secretary Chertoff, on February 9, 2006, also said the following:

When you're dealing with the desert, for example, we don't advocate putting a fence in the desert because it's more efficient for us to intercept people when they're in the desert at a place of our own choosing as opposed to being forced to guard the entire fence, right up against the fence.

From our friend, Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, speaking about the fence, back in those days: "I think that's contrary to our traditions," he said, noting that "99.9 percent" of illegal immigrants "come across to seek a better life for their families. . . ." This is from Attorney General Gonzales.

He continued and said:

I don't know if that would make much sense. We've got a 2,000-mile border. Because of natural geography, we don't need a fence . . . along certain portions of that border. Obviously, we believe it does make sense to have fencing along certain areas of our border. We do have several hundred miles of fencing currently, but the objective here is to make sure we're being smart in securing our border.

Commissioner W. Ralph Basham from Customs and Border Protection said:

It doesn't make sense, it's not practical.

We are in the last week of the legislative session, doing our business prior to the time we go out for elections. So what has happened here? What has happened here is people have decided to ride this horse of immigration reform, with all the divisiveness it has created around the country, to try to gain a political advantage in these November elections. It would be my hope that

Democrats and Republicans of this body, who stood with the President in calling for comprehensive immigration reform, would stand by those principles and say: We are going to push forward for immigration reform that really works for our country because it addresses all aspects of the immigration issue we face in America.

We as a Senate did that several months ago. I was very proud to have worked with people such as Senator MCCAIN, Senator GRAHAM, Senator DURBIN, Senator KENNEDY, and a whole host of other people who were involved in putting together what became a comprehensive immigration reform package. It was a law-and-order bill that we debated here on the floor for weeks and was ultimately adopted by a significant bipartisan group of Senators. It was a law-and-order bill because it dealt in a comprehensive way with the issue of immigration. It dealt in a comprehensive way with the recognition that we have a national security crisis on our hands that requires us to deal with immigration reform in a comprehensive way.

The components of the legislative which we subsequently shepherded through the Senate included border security, strengthening our border. It included immigration law enforcement so we make sure that we as a nation uphold our tradition of being a nation of laws; that we enforce our immigration laws here in our country.

It also includes huge registration penalties applying against those who have broken the law and have come to this country illegally.

The law and order bill deserves the support of the Senate. It is my hope as we move forward in the debate on immigration this week that we return to that legislation and move that legislation as an amendment to the legislation which has been introduced in this body.

Let me again quickly walk through to refresh my colleagues' memory about the components of this legislation which we felt so urgently was needed to deal with national security and the economic and human reality relating to the immigration issue.

First, we all want our borders secure. We recognize we can't have a secure nation if we can't deal with the threats we face with homeland security unless we secure the border. We recognize the United States of America as a sovereign nation has a sovereign right to protect its borders. We need to make sure we are protecting our borders.

We included in our legislation many aspects of a cross-border security solution. They included 12,000 new Border Patrol agents which we would add to our Border Patrol effort to make sure we have the right manpower to address the border security issue.

In that legislation through an amendment that was sponsored by our friend from Alabama, we created additional fences that would be established along the border, some 370 miles of